

so it is timely to talk about it right now.

Also, it is timely to talk about this issue because the General Accounting Office has released a report exhaustively reviewing major missile defense programs—with interesting and useful findings, if we will listen to those findings.

Let's look at that GAO report. The report made some very telling observations. Among them was that the missile defense to be deployed in September simply will not be proven yet, because it hasn't been tested against realistic targets. The GAO recommends that realistic operational tests should be conducted on the missile defense system, which many of us have been saying. How in the world can you deploy something that has not been developed and tested?

The GAO recommends we establish clear and firm missile defense goals. I don't see how we can operate and manage a complex, expensive program like this without goals. The report also took a hard, unbiased look at what progress was being made on these missile defense programs. The GAO spent close to a year doing research going beyond the rhetoric to understand what was going on scientifically and fiscally among these complex programs.

What did the GAO find? Well, they found some major problems, problems that should concern all of us who support a true working missile defense for our homeland. I want to repeat that—problems that concern those of us who truly support a working missile defense program for our homeland.

The GAO found, for example, the prime contractors for 2 of the missile defense programs had cost overruns totaling almost \$400 million during fiscal year 2003 alone.

The GAO found the first increment of missile defense to be deployed in September is going to cost a billion dollars more than the Pentagon thought it would cost a year ago. That is a billion dollars of cost growth in a single year. I want this program to be successful, and I also want it to be fiscally responsible.

The GAO also found the airborne laser program is more than a year behind schedule and projected to go over budget between a half billion dollars and a billion dollars. Let's look at that airborne laser program for a moment. It is a fascinating technology, using a laser cannon mounted on a 747 aircraft to shoot down missiles while they are rising in the boost phase of an ICBM flight.

In March 2003, only a year ago, during the Senate Armed Services Committee hearing on missile defense, I asked the Lieutenant General Kadish, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, about the airborne laser. He told me it was going to be working within a year. Well, we know now—not from him, but from the GAO report—that at the time of the hearing last year, the airborne laser program was

already significantly behind schedule and had more than \$100 million in cost overruns a year ago when I asked the question in the Armed Services Committee. But they didn't tell us that.

According to the GAO, just about everything that can go wrong with this program has gone wrong. General Kadish did not tell us that a year ago. The report says:

Numerous and continuing issues have caused the [program] to slip, including supply, quality, and technical problems.

I continue the quote:

For example, specialized valves have been recalled twice, laser fluid management software has been delayed due to inadequate definition of requirements, and improperly cleaned plumbing and material issues have required over 3,000 hours of unplanned work. In addition, delays in hardware delivery occurred in almost every month of fiscal year 2003.

Why didn't they tell us that last year? It is, again, symptomatic of the executive branch not deferring to the proper balance of powers as envisioned by the Constitution. Instead, they are asking the legislative branch to do its bidding. This has to stop for the sake of the balance of powers of this country.

Even as these problems were occurring with the airborne laser, more money was pouring into the program. The Missile Defense Agency spent about a billion dollars on the airborne laser in 2002 and 2003, and the administration has asked for another half billion dollars in fiscal year 2005 for this same program.

The Pentagon has not been forthcoming with this sort of information. If it weren't for this GAO report, it is not likely the Congress would understand how serious the problems are with this airborne laser program. I wish it were not so, because wouldn't it be good for America if we suddenly had an airborne laser that could shoot down an ascending rocket heading for an American target?

The airborne laser program is not the only surprise in the GAO report. The report reveals computer programs needed for Navy ships to work with the administration's missile defense system won't be tested adequately prior to the planned September deployment of the system. Since these ships are needed to protect Hawaii from a missile launch, Hawaii is now unprotected. That same report reveals major delays with the administration's missile defense plans. It says:

Flight tests leading up to the [deployment] have slipped [over] 10 months, largely as a consequence of delays in [missile defense] interceptor development and delivery. Accordingly, the test schedule leading up to the September [deployment] has been severely compressed, limiting [the] opportunity to characterize [the system's] performance prior to the initial fielding.

The report goes on:

The production and delivery of all 20 interceptors by the end of [December 2005] is uncertain—contractors have not demonstrated

that they can meet the increased production rate.

Given the reality of the technical problems, the schedule delays, and the lack of operational testing, can we justify to the American people spending hundreds of millions of dollars in 2005 to continue to buy more missile defense interceptors than we already have?

I want them to be successful. Let's make sure what we have is going to, in fact, work because the GAO report reveals many of the administration's missile defense programs are in serious trouble with major cost overruns, schedule delays, and inadequate testing. Even to the most enthusiastic supporters of missile defense among us, it should be clear that technology is not proving itself as fast as we had hoped. Given the fact a missile attack against the U.S. is probably lower on the list in terms of probability than other attacks, and given what is going on right now in the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, I think it is clear we need to look carefully and objectively at this missile defense budget and see if we should not spend some of this money on making sure we get it right through the development and testing, and some of that money for our soldiers and marines in battle right now so they can fight and win.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, how much time is remaining for morning business on our side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are 15 minutes remaining on the Republican side.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes in morning business, and I request that the Chair let me know when there are 2 minutes remaining.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Chair.

TRIBUTE TO MARVIN RUNYON

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have three topics I wish to speak about today. The first is about Marvin Runyon. Marvin Runyon is a man known to almost all Tennesseans. He died last night. He had a remarkable career.

Marvin Runyon and his Nissan team brought the automobile industry to Tennessee, creating jobs and better lives for tens of thousands of families. They built from scratch the largest and most efficient car and truck plant in North America.

For an encore, Marvin Runyon became chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority and stabilized TVA rates. And for a double encore, he became the Postmaster General of the United States, and in the year he left, if I am not mistaken, the Post Office made a profit. It is rare that our country has produced a better chief executive officer. I am certain Tennessee has

never produced a better one. He has three wonderful stories all after 50 years of age.

Prior to that, Mr. Runyon was a senior executive at Ford Motor Company. It was in 1980, in my second year as Governor, when Nissan hired that team of Ford executives. They came to Tennessee, a State that was not building any cars or trucks, only had a few thousand, I would say, automobile supplier jobs.

Today, Tennessee is the third or fourth largest producer of cars and trucks. One-third of our manufacturing jobs are automotive. There are several reasons for that development, but it would not have happened if Marvin Runyon and his Nissan team had not chosen to come to Tennessee in 1980.

My wife and I and our family have lost a dear friend, Tennesseans have lost a friend, and I wanted to pay tribute to a man who literally changed the lives of tens of thousands of families for the better by his work in bringing the automobile industry to Tennessee and stabilizing the Tennessee Valley Authority.

FAMOUS MUSIC CORP/ HORNBUCKLE MUSIC

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I wish to talk about songwriters. Italy has its art, and California and Oregon have fine wine, Hollywood has movies, Dalton, GA, has carpets, and Nashville has songwriters.

There are a great many beautiful songs that come from Nashville—poems—but I want to especially commend to my colleagues a new song called “Letters from Home.” You may hear John Michael Montgomery sing it. It is a poem that touches the heart of Americans at this time. It is especially meaningful with the men and women of our military in Afghanistan and Iraq and all over the world fighting for freedom.

This is a story about their loved ones awaiting their coming home. The last stanza goes like this:

I hold it up and show my buddies
Like we ain't scared an' our boots ain't
muddy
But no one laughs 'cause there's
Ain't nothin' funny when a'
Soldier cries.
So I just wipe my eyes
Fold it up and put it in my shirt
Pick up my gun and get back to work
And it keeps drivin' on, waitin' on letters
from home.

That song was written by Tony Lane and David Lee. I saw them a couple weeks ago at Belmont University in Nashville. Belmont celebrated the introduction of a course on “Poetics in Country Music,” to explore literary criticism of song lyrics as we do for other poetry. I salute Belmont University for its leadership.

When Johnny Cash died, the New York Times streamed a headline: “Poet of the Working Poor.” Bob Dylan once said Hank Williams was America's greatest poet. I said on the Senate

floor, if that is true, why don't we have English professors somewhere criticizing their poetry? They are all up in Northeastern schools writing good criticism of mediocre poems while we have poets of the working poor and some of the best poets in Nashville writing poems.

“Letters from Home” is yet another great poem from Nashville songwriters and one more example of why Belmont University's pioneering work to discuss “Poetics of the Working Poor” is a good idea.

There might be more in common between Shakespeare's sonnets and Hank Williams stanzas than one at first might imagine.

CALCULATION OF THE EMPLOYMENT RATE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I wish to discuss with my colleagues something of a mystery. I have yet to be able to find an answer to this mystery. I am hoping by addressing it on the Senate floor and by letters I am sending today to Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, their research might help me figure this out.

I asked Chairman Greenspan at our hearing on April 21 of the Joint Economic Committee about the 6 million people, more or less, who are living and working in the United States who our Government is not counting when it makes our monthly projections about who is working and who is unemployed.

Here is what I base that question on: There is a consensus there are 8 to 10 million undocumented aliens or illegal immigrants in the United States today. For example, the Urban Institute estimate says 8 million, and the Center for Immigration Studies says 10 million. The Urban Institute estimates perhaps 6 million or more of those undocumented persons have a job in the United States. I do not think there is much debate about the fact there are 6 million people living in the United States, more or less, who are illegally here who are also working.

My guess is our Government is not counting most of these 6 million undocumented aliens when we announce each month the number of Americans who have jobs. It was 138 million for March and the number who are unemployed, 5.7 percent of the workforce, or 8.4 million people in March.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, which makes these announcements each month, gathers their estimates in two different ways. The first is the so-called payroll survey of 400,000 business establishments. Since it is a violation of Federal criminal laws for a company to employ an undocumented alien, I think it is wrong to assume most or even many of the 6 million illegal immigrants who are working here are reported by the payroll survey. Nor do I believe these 6 million illegal immigrants are likely to be included in the

other principal data-gathering mechanism of the survey, which we call the household survey.

This is a survey of more than 60,000 persons living in the United States which basically asked in many different ways, do you have a job? Now, this must include a lot of people the payroll service does not, people such as farmers, people working at home, independent contractors, and I suspect a lot of people who are here illegally.

I also believe that it paints a much clearer picture of employment in the United States than the payroll survey. Common sense suggests to me that the household survey also does not include many undocumented aliens. If one is an illegal immigrant and they receive a phone call from the Government asking questions, they are not likely to give many answers, I would not think, especially if the phone call is not in their native language.

So I see no basis to assume these 6 million workers—my guess is in most cases hard workers but undocumented aliens—are being counted or that they are being equally uncounched by the two surveys, which is what Mr. Greenspan suggested might be the case. Our failure to find some way to consider the implications of having what I would judge to be so many undocumented aliens working has a great many policy implications.

Now I am not trying in these remarks to solve the great issues of immigration, whether we should have it, how much we should have, what we should do. That is another debate. I am just trying to understand who is here. If 6 million are here and working, are we counting them? It would be helpful to know the answer to that question, to know whether we are understating the number of people living in America who are employed and stating the rate of people in America who are unemployed.

This is one of the principal debates in our presidential campaign: It is the economy, stupid. It is jobs. Well, how do these 6 million uncounched workers affect the information we put out each month upon which we make all of these debates? Also, if we have 8.4 million unemployed, according to our official statistics, and if 6 million illegal immigrants are working, are these 6 million taking jobs that the 8.4 million want? Also, if these 6 million were not here, would we suddenly have virtually full employment?

Another point might be, if these 6 million were not here and the 8.4 million still remained unemployed, or many of them did, that certainly would tell us something about whether we need more or less unemployment insurance, more or fewer training programs, or more or fewer lessons in English. Or if the 6 million illegal workers are actually employed, that would tell us something about the effectiveness of our immigration laws and would help us make more accurate estimates of the contributions these workers might